Origin of report

Party	Switzerland
Contact officer for report	
Name and title of contact officer:	Dr. Albert Spielmann
Mailing address:	CH-3003 Berne Suisse
Telephone:	+41 (0) 31 322 20 82
Fax:	+41 (0) 31 324 79 78
E-mail:	albert.spielmann@buwal.admin.ch
Submission	
Signature of officer responsible for submitting report:	
Date of submission:	

Please provide summary information on the process by which this report has been prepared, including information on the types of stakeholders who have been actively involved in its preparation and on material which was used as a basis for the report:

The report was prepared by the Swiss correspondent for the Cartagena Protocol (who is also the Swiss correspondent for the Biosafety Clearing-House) with the assistance of the legal consultant (Jürg Bally) of the federal agency concerned with the Protocol (Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forests and Landscape, SAEFL — *Office Fédéral de l'Environnement, des Forêts et du Paysage*) and upon consultation with the stakeholders.

Obligations for provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House

1. Several articles of the Protocol require that information be provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House (see the list below). For your Government, if there are cases where relevant information exists but has not been provided to the BCH, describe any obstacles or impediments encountered regarding provision of that information (note: To answer this question, please check the BCH to determine the current status of your country's information submissions relative to the list of required information below. If you do not have access to the BCH, contact the Secretariat for a summary):
All the information which the Cartagena Protocol requests be provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House is presently available on the website of the Swiss Biosafety Clearing-House (CH-BCH, http://www.ch-bch.ch). Moreover, the Swiss Clearing-House is entirely interoperable with the website of the international Clearing-House (http://bch.biodiv.org). In this way, data presented on the CH-BCH website can be transferred automatically to the international Clearing-House. Article 9 of Switzerland's Ordinance on Transboundary Movements of Genetically Modified Organisms[1] *(Ordonnance sur les mouvements transfrontières des organismes génétiquement modifiés)*, also referred to as the CartO (Cartagena Ordinance—*Ordonnance de Cartagena*) defines the modalities for participating in the international mechanism of information exchange. [1] Note: GMO and LMO: The Convention on Biological Diversity and the Cartagena Protocol use the term of "living modified organism" (LMO). In Swiss legislation and current language usage, the term "genetically modified organism" (GMO) is used. The two terms are equivalent.

Information required to be provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House:

(a) Existing national legislation, regulations and guidelines for implementing the Protocol, as well as information required by Parties for the advance informed agreement procedure (Article 20.3(a)*)*

(b) National laws, regulations and guidelines applicable to the import of LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11.5);

(c) Bilateral, multilateral and regional agreements and arrangements (Articles 14.2, 20.3(b), and 24.1);

(d) Contact details for competent national authorities (Articles 19.2 and 19.3), national focal points (Articles 19.1 and 19.3), and emergency contacts (Article 17.2 and 17.3(e));

(e) In cases of multiple competent national authorities, responsibilities for each (Articles 19.2 and 19.3);

(f) Reports submitted by the Parties on the operation of the Protocol (Article 20.3(e));

(g) Occurrence of unintentional transboundary movements that are likely to have significant adverse effects on biological diversity (Article 17.1);

(h) Illegal transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 25.3);

(i) Final decisions regarding the importation or release of LMOs (i.e. approval or prohibition, any conditions, requests for further information, extensions granted, reasons for decision) (Articles 10.3 and 20.3(d));

(j) Information on the application of domestic regulations to specific imports of LMOs (Article 14.4);

(k) Final decisions regarding the domestic use of LMOs that may be subject to transboundary movement for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11.1);

(l) Final decisions regarding the import of LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing that are taken under domestic regulatory frameworks (Article 11.4) or in accordance with Annex III (Article 11.6) (requirement of Article 20.3(d))

(m) Declarations regarding the framework to be used for LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11.6)

(n) Review and change of decisions regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 12.1);

(o) LMOs granted exemption status by each Party (Article 13.1)

(p) Cases where intentional transboundary movement may take place at the same time as the movement is notified to the Party of import (Article 13.1); and

(q) Summaries of risk assessments or environmental reviews of LMOs generated by regulatory processes and relevant information regarding products thereof (Article 20.3(c)).

Article 2 – General provisions

2. Has your country introduced the necessary legal, administrative and other measures for implementation of the Protocol? (Article 2.1)	
a) full domestic regulatory framework in place (please give details below)	yes
b) some measures introduced (please give details below)	
c) no measures yet taken	

3. Please provide further details about your response to the above question, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 2, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:

Switzerland implemented the Cartagena Protocol with the Ordinance on Transboundary Movements of Genetically Modified Organisms (*Ordonnance sur les mouvements transfrontières des organismes génétiquement modifiés*), also referred to as the CartO (Cartagena Ordinance—*Ordonnance de Cartagena*). The CartO aims to fill gaps in the legislation concerning transboundary movements of GMOs in addition to referring to other laws and ordinances that regulate the use of GMOs. CartO went into effect on 1 January 2005.

The responsibility for implementing the Cartagena Protocol in Switzerland lies with the Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forests and Landscape, SAEFL (*Office Fédéral de l'Environnement, des Forêts et du Paysage*). However, other offices are also implicated (Swiss Federal Office of Public Health—*Office fédéral de la santé publique*; Swiss Federal Office for Agriculture—*Office fédéral de l'agriculture*; Swiss Federal Veterinary Office—*Office vétérinaire fédéral*; and the Swiss Agency for Therapeutic Products, Swissmedic—*Institut suisse des produits thérapeutiques, Swissmedic*).

Articles 7 to 10 and 12: The advance informed agreement procedure

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

4. Is there a legal requirement for the accuracy of information provided by exporters 1/ under the jurisdiction of your country? (Article 8.2)	
a) yes	x
b) no	
c) not applicable – not a Party of export	
5. If you were a Party of export during this reporting period, did you request any Party of import to review a decision it had made under Article 10 on the grounds specified in Article 12.2?	
a) yes (please give details below)	
b) no	
c) not applicable – not a Party of export	x
6. Did your country take decisions regarding import under domestic regulatory frameworks as allowed by Article 9.2(c).	
a) yes	
b) no	
c) not applicable – no decisions taken during the reporting period	x
7. If your country has been a Party of export of LMOs intended for release into the environment during the reporting period, please describe your experiences and progress in implementing Articles 7 to 10 and 12, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Not applicable	
8. If your country has taken decisions on import of LMOs intended for release into the environment during the reporting period, please describe your experiences and progress in implementing Articles 7 to 10 and 12, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Not applicable	

1/ The use of terms in the questions follows the meanings accorded to them under Article 3 of the Protocol

Article 11 – Procedure for living modified organisms intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

9. Is there a legal requirement for the accuracy of information provided by the applicant with respect to the domestic use of a living modified organism that may be subject to transboundary movement for direct use as food or feed, or for processing? (Article 11.2)	
a) yes	x
b) no	
c) not applicable (please give details below)	
10. Has your country indicated its needs for financial and technical assistance and capacity building in respect of living modified organisms intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing? (Article 11.9)	
a) yes (please give details below)	
b) no	
c) not relevant	x
11. Did your country take decisions regarding import under domestic regulatory frameworks as allowed by Article 11.4?	
a) yes	x
b) no	
c) not applicable – no decisions taken during the reporting period	
12. If your country has been a Party of export of LMOs intended for direct use for food or feed, or for processing, during the reporting period, please describe your experiences and progress in implementing Article 11, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Not applicable	
13. If your country has been a Party of import of LMOs intended for direct use for food or feed, or for processing, during the reporting period, please describe your experiences and progress in implementing Article 11, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Not applicable	

Article 13 – Simplified procedure

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

14. If your country has used the simplified procedure during the reporting period, please describe your experiences in implementing Article 13, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:
Not applicable

Article 14 – Bilateral, regional and multilateral agreements and arrangements

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

15. If your country has entered into bilateral, regional or multilateral agreements or arrangements, describe your experiences in implementing Article 14 during the reporting period, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:
Switzerland has made use of Article 14.4. This is to say that the national regulation applies to all imports of GMOs in Switzerland, replacing the advance informed agreement procedure. Switzerland notified the Clearing-House of its decision.

Articles 15 and 16 – Risk assessment and risk management

16. If you were a Party of import during this reporting period, were risk assessments carried out for all decisions taken under Article 10? (Article 15.2)	
a) yes	
b) no (please clarify below)	
c) not a Party of import	x
17. If yes, did you require the exporter to carry out the risk assessment?	
a) yes – in all cases	
b) yes – in some cases (please specify the number and give further details below)	
c) no	
d) not a Party of import	x
18. If you took a decision under Article 10 during the reporting period, did you require the notifier to bear the cost of the risk assessment? (Article 15.3)	
a) yes – in all cases	
b) yes – in some cases (please specify the number and give further details below)	
c) no	No imports
19. Has your country established and maintained appropriate mechanisms, measures and strategies to regulate, manage and control risks identified in the risk assessment provisions of the Protocol? (Article 16.1)	
a) yes	x
b) no	
20. Has your country adopted appropriate measures to prevent unintentional transboundary movements of living modified organisms? (Article 16.3)	
a) yes	x
b) no	
21. Does your country endeavour to ensure that any living modified organism, whether imported or locally developed, undergoes an appropriate period of observation commensurate with its life-cycle or generation time before it is put to its intended use? (Article 16.4)	
a) yes – in all cases	x
b) yes – in some cases (please give further details below)	
c) no (please give further details below)	
d) not applicable (please give further details below)	

22. Has your country cooperated with others for the purposes specified in Article 16.5?	
a) yes (please give further details below)	
b) no (please give further details below)	x
23. Please provide further details about your responses to the above questions, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Articles 15 and 16, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	

Article 17 – Unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

24. During the reporting period, if there were any occurrences under your jurisdiction that led, or could have led, to an unintentional transboundary movement of a living modified organism that had, or could have had, significant adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health in such States, did you immediately consult the affected or potentially affected States for the purposes specified in Article 17.4?	
a) yes – all relevant States immediately	
b) partially (please clarify below)	
c) no (please clarify below)	x
25. Please provide further details about your response to the above question, as well as description of your country's experiences in implementing Article 17, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
24. There have been no unintentional transboundary movements. 25. Article 10 of the CartO regulates the procedures to follow and measures to take in case of unintentional transboundary movements. In that case, the concerned cantons notify the occurrence to the SAEFL and inform the population, the neighbouring cantons and the competent regional authorities of the neighbouring countries. The SAEFL notifies the occurrence to the competent national authorities of the neighbouring countries. The SAEFL also registers notifications from foreign countries and informs the concerned cantons.	

Article 18 – Handling, transport, packaging and identification

26. Has your country taken measures to require that living modified organisms that are subject to transboundary movement within the scope of the Protocol are handled, packaged and transported under conditions of safety, taking into account relevant international rules and standards? (Article 18.1)	
a) yes (please give details below)	x
b) no	
c) not applicable (please clarify below)	
27. Has your country taken measures to require that documentation accompanying living modified organisms for direct use as food or feed, or for processing, clearly identifies that they 'may contain' living modified organisms and are not intended for intentional introduction into the environment, as well as a contact point for information? (Article 18.2(a))	
a) yes	See question 30
b) no	
28. Has your country taken measures to require that documentation accompanying living modified organisms that are destined for contained use clearly identifies them as living modified organisms and specifies any requirements for the safe handling, storage, transport and use, the contact point for further information, including the name and address of the individual and institution to whom the living modified organisms are consigned? (Article 18.2(b))	
a) yes	x
b) no	
29. Has your country adopted measures to require that documentation accompanying living modified organisms that are intended for intentional introduction into the environment of the Party of import and any other living modified organisms within the scope of the Protocol, clearly identifies them as living modified organisms; specifies the identity and relevant traits and/or characteristics, any requirements for the safe handling, storage, transport and use, the contact point for further information and, as appropriate, the name and address of the importer and exporter; and contains a declaration that the movement is in conformity with the requirements of this Protocol applicable to the exporter? (Article 18.2(c))	
a) yes	x
b) no	
30. Please provide further details about your responses to the above questions, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 18, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
26: Article 18.1: Article 3 of the CartO entitled "Obligation to take due care" specifies the requirements that govern the import, export or transit of GMOs, in particular concerning the precautions to take to avoid endangering animals, the environment or, indirectly, humans when handling, packaging or transporting GMOs. 27 to 29: Swiss legislation is very clear in terms of the accompanying documentation. For transboundary movement of GMOs, it requires the mention "contains GMOs" and not simply "may contain GMOs". Article 4 of the CartO defines the requirements for the accompanying documentation:	

Article 4: Accompanying Documentation
1. The documentation accompanying the transboundary movements of genetically modified organisms for use in the environment must contain the following information:
a. a clear indication as genetically modified organisms;
b. the unique identifier in accordance with the Annex to the Regulation (EC) No. 65/2004 of the European Commission of 14 January 2004 establishing a system for the development and assignment of unique identifiers for genetically modified organisms or, in the absence of this identifier, the specification of the identity of the organisms with the relevant traits and characteristics;
c. any requirements for the safe handling, storage, transport and use of the organisms;
d. the name and address of the contact point for further information;
e. the name and address of the consignee;
f. a declaration certifying that the movement is in conformity with the requirements of the Cartagena Protocol applicable to the exporter.
2. If genetically modified organisms are intended for processing, for direct use as food or feed or as veterinary medicines, the indication in accordance with Paragraph 1, let. a above must also specify that the genetically modified organisms in question may not under any circumstances be introduced directly into the environment.
3. If the genetically modified organisms are intended for contained use, only the requirements of Paragraph 1, let. a-e above apply.

30: Experiences, progress, difficulties
Switzerland has very little experience with the import and export of GMOs destined to be introduced intentionally into the environment, used directly for food and feed, or transformed. It has, however, had experience with exports and imports of GMOs destined for contained use. In order to inform the concerned Parties on the procedures to follow when importing or exporting GMOs, an explanatory notice was prepared in the form of a newsletter in December 2004. However, the requirements regarding the accompanying documentation were confusing, in particular concerning the import and export of GMOs destined for contained use. Moreover, these requirements also vary depending on the transporter. Consequently, during the COP-MOP2, Switzerland asked the Secretariat to take the initiative of collaborating with the other competent organisations toward harmonising practices in regard to transport and packaging. That proposition was taken up with decision BS-II/6 "Cooperation with other Organizations, Conventions and Initiatives".

Article 19 – Competent national authorities and national focal points

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

Article 20 – Information-sharing and the Biosafety Clearing-House

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

31. In addition to the response to question 1, please describe any further details regarding your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 20, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:
The Parties have many options for making available the information required by the Protocol. Switzerland chose the option of interoperability, i.e. of developing its own databank for the Clearing-House as well as its own website. Its data is automatically available to the international Clearing-House by means of interoperability protocols. The website of the Swiss Clearing-House has been in operation since September 2003 and has been interoperable with the international Clearing-House since February 2004. The main difficulties encountered have been technical in nature, in particular of making data presented on the Swiss Clearing-House compatible with that of the international Clearing-House (interoperability).

Article 21 – Confidential information

32. Does your country have procedures to protect confidential information received under the Protocol and that protect the confidentiality of such information in a manner no less favourable than its treatment of confidential information in connection with domestically produced living modified organisms? (Article 21.3)	
a) yes	x
b) no	
33. If you were a Party of import during this reporting period, did you permit any notifier to identify information submitted under the procedures of the Protocol or required by the Party of import as part of the advance informed agreement procedure that was to be treated as confidential? (Article 21.1)	
a) yes	
If yes, please give number of cases	
b) no	
c) not applicable – not a Party of import	x
34. If you answered yes to the previous question, please provide information on your experience including description of any impediments or difficulties encountered:	
35. If you were a Party of export during this reporting period, please describe any impediments or difficulties encountered by you, or by exporters under your jurisdiction if information is available, in the implementation of the requirements of Article 21:	
Not applicable	

Article 22 – Capacity-building

36. If a developed country Party, during this reporting period has your country cooperated in the development and/or strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety for the purposes of the effective implementation of the Protocol in developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and small island developing States among them, and in Parties with economies in transition?	
a) yes (please give details below)	x
b) no	
c) not applicable – not a developed country Party	

37. If yes, how has such cooperation taken place:

Switzerland participates actively in the capacity building programme developed by the UNEP-GEF (Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH) of the Cartagena Protocol). In that framework, the Swiss government offers any country making the request access to the Swiss Clearing-House database system. At the Clearing-House, that country will have its own website which will be hosted free of charge on the server of GRID-Europe located in Geneva. Switzerland presented the implementation of the Swiss Clearing-House at several international meetings and workshops (Biosafety Clearing-House Training of Trainers Course for Information Technology and Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety Regional Advisors, January 31 – February 12, 2005, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia; Biosafety Clearing-House Training Workshop, May 28 – 29, 2005, Montreal, Canada) and also participated actively in the development of the capacity building programme of the UNEP-GEF during the preparatory workshops and meetings (Workshop on Development of Training Materials for the UNEP-GEF Project for Capacity-Building for the Biosafety Clearing House, May 3-4, 2004, Geneva, Switzerland; Consultation of Regional Scientists and Technical Experts on UNEP-GEF Project for Capacity Building for the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH), December 13 -14, 2004, Geneva, Switzerland).

Switzerland also participated actively at regional meetings organised by UNEP-GEF (French-speaking Africa Workshops, 22-25 April 2003, Dakar, Senegal; Sub-regional French-speaking Africa Workshops (20-23 April 2004, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso) and collaborated on a bilateral basis with one country (Guinea, 2004).

Moreover, in response to the need of developing countries for financial and technical support for capacity building, Switzerland is pursuing many programmes through bilateral and multilateral partnerships. These programmes concern environmental risk assessment, development of interdisciplinary courses in biosafety, development of tools for teaching biosafety, public awareness and the development of a project on risk assessment process methodologies. Presently, four programmes/projects are supported in those fields. Two of them were presented at side events of the MOP2 in Montreal, namely, the GMO ERA project and the foundation for public research and regulation. The other projects involve collaborations with Vietnam, Kenya, Brazil, Mali and Peru and follow the above-mentioned principle. The harmonisation of in-progress activities (instead of developing new initiatives) and the active support of collaboration with third parties (financing agencies, researchers, governments, NGOs and the private sector) are major criteria for the contribution of Switzerland to capacity building in biosafety.

38. If a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition, have you benefited from cooperation for technical and scientific training in the proper and safe management of biotechnology to the extent that it is required for biosafety?

a) yes – capacity-building needs fully met (please give details below)	
b) yes – capacity-building needs partially met (please give details below)	
c) no – capacity-building needs remain unmet (please give details below)	
b) no – we have no unmet capacity-building needs in this area	
e) not applicable – not a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition	x
39. If a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition, have you benefited from cooperation for technical and scientific training in the use of risk assessment and risk management for biosafety?	
a) yes – capacity-building needs fully met (please give details below)	
b) yes – capacity-building needs partially met (please give details below)	
c) no – capacity-building needs remain unmet (please give details below)	
d) no – we have no unmet capacity-building needs in this area	
e) not applicable – not a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition	x

40. If a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition, have you benefited from cooperation for technical and scientific training for enhancement of technological and institutional capacities in biosafety?	
a) yes – capacity-building needs fully met (please give details below)	
b) yes – capacity-building needs partially met (please give details below)	
c) no – capacity-building needs remain unmet (please give details below)	
d) no – we have no unmet capacity-building needs in this area	
e) not applicable – not a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition	x
41. Please provide further details about your responses to the above questions, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 22, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	

Article 23 – Public awareness and participation

42. Does your country promote and facilitate public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms in relation to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health? (Article 23.1(a))	
a) yes – significant extent	x
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	
43. If yes, do you cooperate with other States and international bodies?	
a) yes – significant extent	
b) yes – limited extent	x
c) no	
44. Does your country endeavour to ensure that public awareness and education encompass access to information on living modified organisms identified in accordance with the Protocol that may be imported? (Article 23.1(b))	
a) yes – fully	x
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	
45. Does your country, in accordance with its respective laws and regulations, consult the public in the decision-making process regarding living modified organisms and make the results of such decisions available to the public? (Article 23.2)	
a) yes – fully	x
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	
46. Has your country informed its public about the means of public access to the Biosafety Clearing-House? (Article 23.3)	
a) yes – fully	x
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	
47. Please provide further details about your responses to the above questions, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 23, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Swiss legislation in regard to the procedure for authorising the use of GMOs for contained use, marketing or release into the environment is entirely transparent. In effect, all the authorisation requests and decisions are regularly published by various agencies (Official Gazette, website of the Confederation, websites of the concerned Federal Agencies, Swiss Clearing-House). Awareness-raising of the public and the concerned partners in regard to GMOs is pursued on many levels. For one, a workgroup with the specific mandate to monitor the obligations of the Protocol has been set up. That workgroup is composed of some twenty persons who represent the concerned areas in Switzerland (Federal Agencies, research, agro-food industry and commerce, non-governmental organisations, expert commissions, etc.). Secondly, information meetings are organised regularly for	

those same concerned fields. Finally, the public at large is informed about GMOs by means of Federal Agency websites as well as the publication of brochures or journals. A flyer describing the structure and function of the Swiss Clearing-House (CH-BCH) has been issued recently in four languages (German, French, Italian and English) and is currently distributed to the concerned persons.

Article 24 – Non-Parties

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House**.**

48. If there have been transboundary movements of living modified organisms between your country and a non-Party, please provide information on your experience, including description of any impediments or difficulties encountered:
Not applicable

Article 25 – Illegal transboundary movements

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

49. Has your country adopted appropriate domestic measures to prevent and penalize, as appropriate, transboundary movements of living modified organisms carried out in contravention of its domestic measures? (Article 25.1)	
a) yes	x
b) no	
50. Please provide further details about your response to the above question, as well as description of your country's experiences in implementing Article 25, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
There are no particular measures aside from the penal provisions of the Genetic Engineering Act (*Loi sur le génie génétique*) (Art. 35).	

Article 26 – Socio-economic considerations

51. If during this reporting period your country has taken a decision on import, did it take into account socio-economic considerations arising from the impact of living modified organisms on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, especially with regard to the value of biological diversity to indigenous and local communities? (Article 26.1)	
a) yes – significant extent	
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	
d) not a Party of import	x
52. Has your country cooperated with other Parties on research and information exchange on any socio-economic impacts of living modified organisms, especially on indigenous and local communities? (Article 26.2)	
a) yes – significant extent	
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	x
53. Please provide further details about your responses to the above questions, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 26, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	

Article 28 – Financial mechanism and resources

54. Please indicate if, during the reporting period, your government made financial resources available to other Parties or received financial resources from other Parties or financial institutions, for the purposes of implementation of the Protocol.	
a) yes – made financial resources available to other Parties	
b) yes – received financial resources from other Parties or financial institutions	
c) both	
d) neither	x
55. Please provide further details about your response to the above question, as well as description of your country's experiences, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	

Other information

56. Please use this box to provide any other information related to articles of the Protocol, questions in the reporting format, or other issues related to national implementation of the Protocol:

Comments on reporting format

The wording of these questions is based on the Articles of the Protocol. Please provide information on any difficulties that you have encountered in interpreting the wording of these questions:
